

Remarks

The Office action includes a Restriction Requirement, which alleges that the application contains the following distinct inventions:

- Group I, claims 1-12, 19 and 20, drawn to a method of manufacturing a bush from a blank; and
- Group II, claims 13-18, drawn to a flanged bush.

In response, Applicants elect Group II, claims 13-18, with traverse, for further examination in the present application.

MPEP § 803 states that “[i]f the search and examination of all the claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine them on the merits, even though they include claims to independent or distinct inventions.” Since claims 1-12, 19 and 20 have already been examined, and at least claim 1 has been found to be allowable over the art of record (see the Office’s Interview Summary dated September 1, 2009), there would be no additional burden on the examiner to continue prosecution of all pending claims. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Restriction Requirement be withdrawn.

Moreover, independent claim 1 of Group I has been amended to include the limitations of independent claim 13 of Group II. Independent claim 20 also has been amended to include the limitations of claim 13. MPEP § 821.04(b) states that when claims directed to a product are found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim may be rejoined. Accordingly, to the extent claims 13-18 are found allowable, Applicants respectfully request that claims 1-12, 19 and 20 be rejoined and allowed along with claims 13-18.

The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if a phone interview would expedite allowance or further prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By /Jeffrey B. Haendler/
Jeffrey B. Haendler
Registration No. 43,652